Natural Resources Conservation Service

Application Ranking Summary

Upper Arkansas WS - Forestry

| Program: | Ranking Date: | Application Number: |
|--|---------------|---------------------|
| Ranking Tool: Upper Arkansas WS - Forestry | | Applicant: |
| Final Ranking Score: | | Address: |
| Planner: | | Telephone: |
| Farm Location: | | |

National Priorities Addressed

| Issue Questions | Responses |
|--|---------------|
| Clean and Abundant Water: Water Quality - Will the proposed project assist the producer to: | |
| a. Meet regulatory requirements relating to animal feeding operations, or proactively avoid the need for regulatory measures? | Yes O or No O |
| 1. b. Reduce sediment, nutrients or pesticides from agricultural operations located within a field that adjoins a designated impaired water body? | Yes O or No O |
| 1. c. Reduce sediment, nutrients or pesticides from agricultural operations located within a field that adjoins a water body? | Yes O or No O |
| Clean and Abundant Water: Water Conservation - Will the proposed project assist the producer to: | |
| 2. a. Increase groundwater recharge in identified groundwater depletion areas (http://water.usgs.gov/ogw/rasa/html/TOC.html)? | Yes O or No O |
| 2. b. Conserve water from irrigation system improvements and result in estimated water savings of at least 5% and saved water will be available for other beneficial uses? | Yes O or No O |
| 2. c. Conserve water in an area where the applicant participates in a geographically established or watershed-wide project? | Yes O or No O |
| Clean Air: Treatment of Air Quality from Agricultural Sources - Will the proposed project assist the producer to: | |
| 3. a. Meet regulatory requirements relating to air quality or proactively avoid the need for regulatory measures? | Yes O or No O |
| 3. b. Reduce green house gases such as methane, nitrous oxide, and volatile organic compounds (VOC)? | Yes O or No O |
| 3. c. Increase carbon sequestration? | Yes O or No O |
| High Quality, Productive Soils Erosion Reduction - Will the proposed project assist the producer to: | |
| 4. a. Reduce erosion to tolerable limits (Soil "T")? | Yes O or No O |
| Healthy Plant and Animal Communities Wildlife Habitat Conservation - Will the proposed project assist the producer to: | |
| 5. a. Benefit threatened and endangered, at-risk, candidate, or species of concern as identified in a State wildlife plan? | Yes O or No O |
| 5. b. Retain wildlife and plant benefits on land exiting the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)? | Yes O or No O |
| High Quality, Productive Soils, Healthy Plant and Animal Communities: Special Environmental Efforts/Initiatives - Will the proposed project assist the producer to: | |
| 6. a. Eradicate or control noxious or invasive species? | Yes O or No O |
| 6. b. Increase, improve or establish pollinator habitat? | Yes O or No O |
| 6. c. Implement precision agricultural methods? | Yes O or No O |
| 6. d. Properly dispose of animal carcasses? | Yes O or No O |
| 6. e. Implement an Integrated Pest Management plan? | Yes O or No O |
| Energy Conservation – Will the proposed project assist the producer to: | |
| 7. a. Reduce energy consumption on the agricultural operation? | Yes O or No O |
| 7. b. Increase on-farm energy efficiency with more efficient equipment? | Yes O or No O |

| 7. c. Assist in implementing energy conservation measures that reduce emissions from GHGs and air pollutants? | Yes O or No O |
|--|---------------|
| Business Lines - Conservation Implementation Additional Ranking Considerations - Will the proposed project result in: | |
| 8. a. Implementation of all planned conservation practices within three years of contract obligation? | Yes O or No O |
| 8. b. Improvement of existing conservation practices or conservation systems already in place at the time the application is accepted, or will complete an existing conservation system? | Yes O or No O |
| Does the applicant meet the following conditions: | |
| 9. a. If the applicant has an existing EQIP contract, has it been, and is it now, on schedule and in full compliance? | Yes O or No O |
| 9. b. Did the applicant successfully complete any past contract(s) in full compliance? | Yes O or No O |
| 9. c. Is this the applicant's first EQIP application? | Yes O or No O |

State Issues Addressed

| Issue Questions | Responses |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Will the project reduce the amount of nutrients/pesticides/salt/selenium or other pollutants entering ground or surface waters? | Yes O or No O |
| 2. Will the planned practice(s) promote water conservation on the contracted acres? | Yes O or No O |
| 3. Does the project increase the diversity of desirable plants on grazing lands? | Yes O or No O |
| 4. Does the project improve the health of riparian and/or wetland areas? | Yes O or No O |
| 5. Does the project improve habitat for a wildlife species currently categorized as a State or Federal T&E species, Federal Candidate or Proposed species, or State Species of Concern? | Yes O or No O |
| 6. Will the planned practice(s) reduce irrigation induced or streambank erosion? | Yes O or No O |

Local Issues Addressed

| Issue Questions | Responses |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Does the applicant have a forest management plan approved by a qualified forester, TSP certified in forestry planning, or NRCS person certified in planning forest land that addresses the concerns the application? | |
| 2. Is the proposed project and practices that will be contracted part of an adjoining multi-landowner project? | Yes O or No O |
| 3. Is the planned conservation treatment part of a post-burn recovery effort or does the planned conservation treatment impact potential burn by the reduction of hazardous fuels for the prevention of wildfires? | |
| 4. Is there a documented problem associated with an invasive species or pest such as the lps bark beetle? | Yes O or No O |
| 5. Does the conservation treatment include the installation of practices that improve and enhance upland wildlife habitat as a part of the overall operation of the agricultural enterprise, including invasive species control? | |
| 6. Forest Riparian Management-Grazing: Will the project provide livestock watering out of the riparian area, or provide limited access to water with the use of water gaps and /or stream crossings designed to limit livestock access to stream banks? | Yes O or No O |
| 7. If grazed forest, will grazing land monitoring be conducted by any one of the following methods (photo points, forage analysis, permanent transects)? | Yes O or No O |
| Assessment of Site Specific Potential Environmental Benefit-Colorado State Forest Service (CSFS) Statewide Forest Resource Assessment. (Answer only one 8a-8d, yes, if applicable) | |
| 8. a. Is the proposed project in a Low Value 12 digit HUC (6th level watershed) per the CSFS Statewide Forest Resource Assessment Final Theme Analysis? | Yes O or No O |
| 8. b. Is the proposed project in a Moderate Value 12 digit HUC (6th level watershed) per the CSFS Statewide Forest Resource Assessment Final Theme Analysis? | Yes O or No O |
| 8. c. Is the proposed project in a High Value 12 digit HUC (6th level watershed) per the CSFS Statewide Forest Resource Assessment Final Theme Analysis? | Yes O or No O |
| 8. d. Is the proposed project in a Very High Value 12 digit HUC (6th level watershed) per the CSFS Statewide Forest Resource Assessment Final Theme Analysis? | Yes O or No O |
| Assessment of Site Specific Potential Environmental Benefit-Fire Regime Class. Points based on fire regime condition class (FRCC), according to Landfire fire regime data. (Answer only one 9a-9c, yes, if applicable) | |

| 9. a. Is the proposed project in a predominantly Fire Regime Condition Class I (low departure) area? | Yes O or No O |
|---|---------------|
| 9. b. Is the proposed project in a predominantly Fire Regime Condition Class II (moderate departure) area? | Yes O or No O |
| 9. c. Is the proposed project in a predominantly Fire Regime Condition Class III (high departure) area? | Yes O or No O |
| Conservation treatment that will be implemented that results in enhanced plant diversity and vigor by improved management of the grazed forest system. (Answer only one 10a-10e, yes, if applicable) | |
| 10. a. Does the conservation treatment include the installation of practices that improves grazing rotation with a switchback system? | Yes O or No O |
| 10. b. Does the conservation treatment include the installation of practices that improves grazing rotation with a rest-rotation system? | Yes O or No O |
| 10. c. Does the conservation treatment include the installation of practices that improves grazing rotation with a deferred rotation system? | Yes O or No O |
| 10. d. Does the conservation treatment include the installation of practices that improves grazing rotation with a limited pasture rotational grazing system? | Yes O or No O |
| 10. e. Does the conservation treatment include the installation of practices that improves grazing rotation with a standard short duration cell grazing system? | Yes O or No O |
| Conservation treatment that will be implemented that results in enhanced plant diversity and vigor by improved management of the grazed forest system. (Answer only one 11a-11b, yes, if applicable) | |
| 11. a. Does the conservation treatment include modification of grazing duration to allow each pasture to be grazed during growing season for 15 days or less each time AND each pasture grazed at a different time from year to year? | Yes O or No O |
| 11. b. Does the conservation treatment include modification of grazing duration such that a scheduled rotation is used that will allow the grazing duration in each pasture to be greater than 15 days but less than or equal to 30 days AND each pasture is grazed at a different time from year to year? | Yes O or No O |
| Forest Riparian Management-Stream Stabilization: Conservation treatment addressing streams running thru forests and associated stream stabilization practices. (Answer only one 12a-12c, yes, if applicable) | |
| 12. a. Improvement in riparian/stream health as measured with the Stream Visual Assessment Protocol 2 (SVAP2) by an increase in score of 5 or greater relative to the current benchmark condition. | Yes O or No O |
| 12. b. Improvement in riparian/stream health as measured with the Stream Visual Assessment Protocol 2 (SVAP2) by an increase in score of 3 but less than 5 relative to the current benchmark condition. | Yes O or No O |
| 12. c. Improvement in riparian/stream health as measured with the Stream Visual Assessment Protocol 2 (SVAP2) by an increase in score of less than 3 relative to the current benchmark condition. | Yes O or No O |
| Conservation treatment resulting in reduction of concentrated water erosion on offered acres as documented on CPA-52. Points are based on the percent of the offered acres affected by ephemeral and/or classic gullies that will be addressed with the conservation treatment. (Answer only one 13a-13c, yes, if applicable) | |
| 13. a. Percent (%) of applicable acres affected by concentrated flow that are treated >0 but =<25? | Yes O or No O |
| 13. b. Percent (%) of applicable acres affected by concentrated flow that are treated >25 but =<50? | Yes O or No O |
| 13. c. Percent (%) of applicable acres affected by concentrated flow that are treated >50? | Yes O or No O |
| | |

Land Use:

| Resource Concerns | Practices |
|----------------------|-----------|
| Ranking Score | |
| Efficiency: | |
| Local Issues: | |
| State Issues: | |
| National Issues: | |
| Final Ranking Score: | |

| This ranking report is for your information. It does not in any way guarantee funding. When funding becomes available, you will be notified if your app | lication is |
|---|-------------|
| selected for funding. Some changes to the application may be required before a final contract is awarded. | |

Notes:

| • | Applicant Signature Not Required on this report for Contract Development unless required by State policy: |
|-----------------|---|
| Signature Date: | Signature Date: |